



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/764,017	01/23/2004	Nataraj Kumar Gobbak	100204975-1	8963
22879	7590	01/10/2005		
HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400			EXAMINER HAMDAN, WASSEEM H	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2854	

DATE MAILED: 01/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/764,017

Applicant(s)

GOBBAK ET AL.

Examiner

Wasseem H Hamdan

Art Unit

2854

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 January 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 and 13-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 11 and 12 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 January 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 01/23/2004.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Specification*

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The “Field of the Invention” and “Brief Summary of the Invention” sections are missing from the specification.

Please see below about the Content of Specification.

Appropriate correction is required.

The following guidelines illustrate the preferred layout for the specification of a utility application. These guidelines are suggested for the applicant's use.

### Content of Specification

- (a) Title of the Invention: See 37 CFR 1.72(a) and MPEP § 606. The title of the invention should be placed at the top of the first page of the specification unless the title is provided in an application data sheet. The title of the invention should be brief but technically accurate and descriptive, preferably from two to seven words may not contain more than 500 characters.
- (b) Cross-References to Related Applications: See 37 CFR 1.78 and MPEP § 201.11.
- (c) Statement Regarding Federally Sponsored Research and Development: See MPEP § 310.
- (d) Incorporation-By-Reference Of Material Submitted On a Compact Disc: The specification is required to include an incorporation-by-reference of electronic documents that are to become part of the permanent United States Patent and Trademark Office records in the file of a patent application. See 37 CFR 1.52(e) and MPEP § 608.05. Computer program listings (37 CFR 1.96(c)), “Sequence Listings” (37 CFR 1.821(c)), and tables having more than 50 pages of text were permitted as electronic documents on compact discs beginning on September 8, 2000.  
  
Or alternatively, Reference to a “Microfiche Appendix”: See MPEP § 608.05(a). “Microfiche Appendices” were accepted by the Office until March 1, 2001.
- (e) Background of the Invention: See MPEP § 608.01(c). The specification should set forth the Background of the Invention in two parts:

- (1) Field of the Invention: A statement of the field of art to which the invention pertains. This statement may include a paraphrasing of the applicable U.S. patent classification definitions of the subject matter of the claimed invention. This item may also be titled "Technical Field."
- (2) Description of the Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 37 CFR 1.98: A description of the related art known to the applicant and including, if applicable, references to specific related art and problems involved in the prior art which are solved by the applicant's invention. This item may also be titled "Background Art."
- (f) Brief Summary of the Invention: See MPEP § 608.01(d). A brief summary or general statement of the invention as set forth in 37 CFR 1.73. The summary is separate and distinct from the abstract and is directed toward the invention rather than the disclosure as a whole. The summary may point out the advantages of the invention or how it solves problems previously existent in the prior art (and preferably indicated in the Background of the Invention). In chemical cases it should point out in general terms the utility of the invention. If possible, the nature and gist of the invention or the inventive concept should be set forth. Objects of the invention should be treated briefly and only to the extent that they contribute to an understanding of the invention.
- (g) Brief Description of the Several Views of the Drawing(s): See MPEP § 608.01(f). A reference to and brief description of the drawing(s) as set forth in 37 CFR 1.74.
- (h) Detailed Description of the Invention: See MPEP § 608.01(g). A description of the preferred embodiment(s) of the invention as required in 37 CFR 1.71. The description should be as short and specific as is necessary to describe the invention adequately and accurately. Where elements or groups of elements, compounds, and processes, which are conventional and generally widely known in the field of the invention described and their exact nature or type is not necessary for an understanding and use of the invention by a person skilled in the art, they should not be described in detail. However, where particularly complicated subject matter is involved or where the elements, compounds, or processes may not be commonly or widely known in the field, the specification should refer to another patent or readily available publication which adequately describes the subject matter.
- (i) Claim or Claims: See 37 CFR 1.75 and MPEP § 608.01(m). The claim or claims must commence on separate sheet or electronic page (37 CFR 1.52(b)(3)). Where a claim sets forth a plurality of elements or steps, each element or step of the claim should be separated by a line indentation. There may be plural indentations to further segregate subcombinations or related steps. See 37 CFR 1.75 and MPEP § 608.01(i)-(p).

Art Unit: 2854

- (j) Abstract of the Disclosure: See MPEP § 608.01(f). A brief narrative of the disclosure as a whole in a single paragraph of 150 words or less commencing on a separate sheet following the claims. In an international application which has entered the national stage (37 CFR 1.491(b)), the applicant need not submit an abstract commencing on a separate sheet if an abstract was published with the international application under PCT Article 21. The abstract that appears on the cover page of the pamphlet published by the International Bureau (IB) of the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) is the abstract that will be used by the USPTO. See MPEP § 1893.03(e).
- (k) Sequence Listing. See 37 CFR 1.821-1.825 and MPEP §§ 2421-2431. The requirement for a sequence listing applies to all sequences disclosed in a given application, whether the sequences are claimed or not. See MPEP § 2421.02.

### *Claim Objections*

2. Claims 3 and 4 are objected to because of the following informalities: claims 3 and 4 are missing a period "." at the end of the claim. Claim must end with a period. Appropriate correction is required.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-7, 9, 10, 13-25 and 27-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Richardson et al. (US Patent 5,748,483).

Regarding claim 1, Richardson et al. discloses a method of correcting an exception [Per applicant's admission in the specification on page 1, line 27, "an exception" is the same as "an error condition"] during a printing process [FIGS. 1 and 2; column 4, lines 66-67; column 5,

Art Unit: 2854

lines 1-4] at least partially controlled by a plurality of print process modules associated with a printing device [column 2, lines 22-29; column 6, lines 7-12; 102], the method comprising:

monitoring, from a self-correcting module [column 6, lines 7-12], a state of each of a plurality of the print process modules, wherein the print process modules interact according to a set of rules to control the printing process [column 2, lines 30-40];

determining that an event [according to the applicant's specification on page 11, line 2, "an event" is the same as "an exception" and "an exception" is "an error condition" and it is the same as "a fault"] has occurred [column 2, line 35], and setting a current state of the at least one print process module to a default condition [column 2, lines 40-45. In Richardson et al. "The system controller is further configured to generate error-recovery signals in response to error signals generated by the collator and printer controllers, thereby causing the modular printing system to automatically recover from printer and collator errors". Technically, it is the same as setting the system (as claimed) to default condition, because technically in the automatic recovery, it is basically that the programmed controller generates the signal to the modules in sequences to go through initialization and each module will put back to its initial states, and hence each module will put back to its default condition or state, i.e. automatic recovery, see also Richardson et al. column 6, lines 7-12].

Regarding claim 2, Richardson et al. discloses determining that an event has occurred includes determining that the printing device is hung [column 1, lines 44-47; column 4, lines 63-67; 102 (paper-jams are considered to be errors, and errors cause the system to pause or hung

until the recovery takes place. Even when the system pauses for few milliseconds, it is considered that the system is paused or hunged)).

Regarding claim 3, Richardson et al. discloses determining that the printing device is hung is based on at least one predetermined rule and the state of at least one print process module [column 1, lines 44-47; column 2, lines 32-35; column 4, lines 63-67 (paper-jams are considered to be errors, and errors cause the system to pause or hung until the recovery takes place. Even when the system pauses for few milliseconds, it is considered that the system is paused or hunged))].

Regarding claim 4, Richardson et al. discloses monitoring includes receiving a status message from each of the printing process modules into a global event history queue of the self-correcting module [column 33, lines 59-64. In Richardson et al. generating a job lists after system manager provides snapshots of current status of various modules is considered to be the same as the claimed limitation for global event history].

Regarding claim 5, Richardson et al. discloses determining includes examining the global event history queue to determine whether the conditions of the predetermined rule are met [column 33, lines 64-67].

Regarding claim 6, Richardson et al. discloses determining further includes verifying that the conditions of the rule remain satisfied over a predetermined period of time [column 13, lines 43-46].

Regarding claim 7, Richardson et al. discloses setting is accomplished at least in part by sending a reset command to the at least one print process module from the self-correcting module [column 2, lines 40-45; column 6, lines 7-14].

Regarding claim 9, Richardson et al. discloses the plurality of print process modules includes a paper path module [column 2, lines 29-32].

Regarding claim 10, Richardson et al. discloses the paper path module includes a print controller and an engine controller [column 2, lines 22-27].

Regarding claim 13, Richardson et al. discloses each of the print process modules is stored as firmware within the printing device [column 6, lines 7-17; column 34, lines 18-25].

Regarding claim 14, Richardson et al. discloses a method of correcting an exception [column 2, lines 22-29. Per applicant's admission in the specification on page 1, line 27, "an exception" is the same as "an error condition"] during a printing process in a printing device [FIGS. 1 and 2; column 4, lines 66-67; column 5, lines 1-4; 102], comprising:



monitoring a current state of a plurality of print process modules [column 2, lines 30-40] in the printing device [FIGS. 1 and 2; 102], the print process modules being configured to at least partially control the printing process [column 2, lines 22-29; column 6, lines 7-12], determining an expected state of at least one print process module [column 2, line 35],

comparing the current state to an expected state of the at least one print process module [column 23, lines 6-15];

detecting a discrepancy between the current state and the expected state [column 23, lines 6-15], and

setting the current state of the at least one print process module to a default condition [column 2, lines 40-45. In Richardson et al. "The system controller is further configured to generate error-recovery signals in response to error signals generated by the collator and printer controllers, thereby causing the modular printing system to automatically recover from printer and collator errors". Technically, it is the same as setting the system (as claimed) to default condition, because technically in the automatic recovery, it is basically that the programmed controller generates the signal to the modules in sequences to go through initialization and each module will put back to its initial states, and hence each module will put back to its default condition or state, i.e. automatic recovery, see also Richardson et al. column 6, lines 7-12].

Regarding claim 15, Richardson et al. discloses wherein the plurality of print process modules includes a job module, a paper path module, and a data path module [FIGS. 1 and 2; column 2, lines 1-45; column 4, lines 53-57; column 6, lines 7-17, meet the claim language

because, as described in the “Microsoft Press Computer Dictionary”, Third Edition on pages 312-313, a Module is:

1. In programming, a collection of routines and data structures that performs a particular task or implements a particular abstract data type. Modules usually consist of two parts: an interface, which lists the constants, data types, variables, and routines that can be accessed by other modules or routines, and an implementation, which is private (accessible only to the module) and which contains the source code that actually implements the routines in the module. *See also* abstract data type, information hiding, Modula-2, modular programming.

2. In hardware, a self-contained component that can provide a complete function to a system and can be interchanged with other modules that provide similar functions. *See also* memory card, SIMM.”].

Regarding claim 16, Richardson et al. discloses wherein monitoring the current state includes receiving a status message from each of the print process modules at a self-correcting module [column 33, lines 59-64].

Regarding claim 17, Richardson et al. discloses wherein determining includes determining an expected state for the at least one print process module based on an event history and a predetermined event rules [column 33, lines 59-64; according to the applicant’s specification on page 11, line 2, “an event is the same as “an exception” and “an exception” is the same as “an error condition or state” and it is the same as “a fault”. In Richardson et al.

Art Unit: 2854

generating a job lists after system manager provides snapshots of current status of various modules is considered to be the same as the claimed limitation for global event history].

Regarding claims 18 and 20, Richardson et al. discloses wherein self-correcting module is stored at least partially as firmware of the printing device [column 6, lines 7-17. In Richardson et al. the “programmable readable memory” that is disclosed in column 34, lines 18-25, is considered to be firmware or where the firmware resides, which meets the claim language].

Regarding claim 19, Richardson et al. discloses wherein the self-correcting module is stored at least partially within software in communication with the printing device through a network [731].

Regarding claim 21, Richardson et al. discloses a self-correcting printing system [FIGS. 1 and 2; column 2, lines 43-45] comprising a printing device [102] having an instruction set including a plurality of print process modules configured to at least partially control a printing process in the printing device [column 2, lines 22-29; column 6, lines 7-12], a self-correcting module [column 2, lines 44-45] including:

- a module status monitor configured to monitor a current state of at least a plurality of print process modules of the instruction set [column 2, lines 30-40; column 33, lines 59-64];

- a plurality of event rules that describe a manner in which the plurality of print modules interact [column 6, lines 7-2; column 33, lines 59-64],

an event history configured to store information relating to a state of the print process modules [column 33, lines 59-64; according to the applicant's specification on page 11, line 2, "an event is the same as "an exception" and "an exception" is the same as "an error condition or state" and it is the same as "a fault". In Richardson et al. generating a job lists after system manager provides snapshots of current status of various modules is considered to be the same as the claimed limitation for global event history],

a hang detector configured to detect a hang condition among the plurality of print process modules based on the event history and event rules [column 1, lines 44-47; column 4, lines 63-67 (paper-jams are considered errors, and errors cause the system to pause or hung until the automatic recovery occurred, even when the system pause in few milliseconds, it is considered that the system is paused or hunged); column 6, lines 7-17; column 33, lines 59-67], and

a correction mechanism configured to change the current state of the at least one print process module to a default state, upon detection of the hang condition [column 2, line 35; column 2, lines 40-45. In Richardson et al. "The system controller is further configured to generate error-recovery signals in response to error signals generated by the collator and printer controllers, thereby causing the modular printing system to automatically recover from printer and collator errors". Technically, it is the same as setting the system (as claimed) to default condition, because technically in the automatic recovery, it is basically that the programmed controller generates the signal to the modules in sequences to go through initialization and each module will put back to its initial states, and hence each module will put back to its default condition or state, i.e. automatic recovery, see also Richardson et al. column 6, lines 7-12].

Regarding claim 22, Richardson et al. discloses wherein the hang detector further includes a comparison mechanism configured to determine an expected state of the at least one print process module, based on the event history and event rules, and to detect a discrepancy between the expected state and the current state of the at least one print process module [column 23, lines 6-15; column 33, lines 59-67].

Regarding claim 23, Richardson et al. discloses wherein the plurality of print process modules includes a job module, a paper path module, and a data path module [FIGS. 1 and 2; column 2, lines 1-45; column 4, lines 53-57; column 6, lines 7-17, meet the claim language because, as described in the "Microsoft Press Computer Dictionary", Third Edition on pages 312-313, a Module is:

1. In programming, a collection of routines and data structures that performs a particular task or implements a particular abstract data type. Modules usually consist of two parts: an interface, which lists the constants, data types, variables, and routines that can be accessed by other modules or routines, and an implementation, which is private (accessible only to the module) and which contains the source code that actually implements the routines in the module. *See also* abstract data type, information hiding, Modula-2, modular programming.

2. In hardware, a self-contained component that can provide a complete function to a system and can be interchanged with other modules that provide similar functions. *See also* memory card, SIMM."].

Regarding claim 24, Richardson et al. discloses wherein the plurality of print process modules are stored as firmware on the printing device [column 6, lines 7-17. In Richardson et al. the “programmable readable memory” that is disclosed in column 34, lines 18-25, is considered to be firmware or where the firmware resides, which meets the claim language].

Regarding claim 25, Richardson et al. discloses wherein the self-correcting module is stored at least partially within software in communication with the printing device through a network [731].

Regarding claim 27, Richardson et al. discloses wherein the module status monitor is configured to monitor the current state of the print process modules by receiving status messages from each of the print process modules, and storing the status messages in the event history [column 33, lines 59-67. In Richardson et al. wherein the system manager 730 generates job lists and allows users to create and edit collation sequences, printer jobs, images for printing, and fonts, technically the created job list has to be stored in memory disclosed on column 34, in order the user to edit the list].

Regarding claim 28, Richardson et al. discloses wherein the self-correcting module further includes a timer configured to determine whether conditions of a rule are satisfied for a predetermined period of time, and wherein the correction mechanism is configured to change the current state of the at least one print process module after the predetermined period of time has elapsed [column 13, lines 44-46; column 14, lines 6-9; 735a; 735b].

Regarding claim 29, Richardson et al. discloses a computer program product [FIGS. 1 and 2; column 2, lines 21-26] comprising:

a computer usable medium having computer readable program code embodied therein for causing correction of an exception condition [column 33, lines 59-64; according to the applicant's specification on page 11, line 2, "an event is the same as "an exception" and "an exception" is the same as "an error condition or state" and it is the same as "a fault"] within firmware [column 6, lines 7-17. In Richardson et al. the "programmable readable memory" that is disclosed in column 34, lines 18-25, is considered to be firmware or where the firmware resides, which meets the claim language] of a printing device [102], the computer readable program code in said computer program product comprising:

computer readable program code configured to cause the printing device to determine a current state [column 33, lines 59-64] of at least one module of the firmware;

computer readable program code configured to cause the printing device to compare the current state to an expected state [column 23, lines 6-15],

computer readable program code configured to cause the printing device to detect a discrepancy between the current state and the expected state [column 23, lines 6-15], and

computer readable program code configured to cause the printing device to set the current state to a default condition [column 2, lines 40-45. In Richardson et al. "The system controller is further configured to generate error-recovery signals in response to error signals generated by the collator and printer controllers, thereby causing the modular printing system to automatically recover from printer and collator errors". Technically, it is the same as setting the system (as claimed) to default condition, because technically in the automatic recovery, it is basically that

Art Unit: 2854

the programmed controller generates the signal to the modules in sequences to go through initialization and each module will put back to its initial states, and hence each module will put back to its default condition or state, i.e. automatic recovery, see also Richardson et al. column 6, lines 7-12].

Regarding claim 30, Richardson et al. discloses further comprising computer readable program code configured to cause the printing device to determine the expected state from an event [according to the applicant's specification on page 11, line 2, "an event is the same as "an exception" and "an exception" is the same as "an error condition or state" and it is the same as "a fault"] history [column 33, lines 59-64. In Richardson et al. the generating a job lists after system manager provides snapshots of current status of various modules is considered to be the same as the claimed for limitation global event history].

Regarding claim 31, Richardson et al. discloses wherein the expected state is determined from the event history using a set of event rules [column 33, lines 59-64. In Richardson et al. the generating a job lists after system manager provides snapshots of current status of various modules and allows users to create and edit collation sequences, and it can be configured to display mechanical performance statistics of the various modules and also efficiency statistics of operators, a benefit of this programmed controller is that it provides a comprehensive and integrated error detection and recovery system, which technically means the same as expected state is determined from the event history using a set of event rules].



***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richardson et al. (US Patent 5,748,483) in view of KIM (Pub. No. US 2003/0095279 A1).

Regarding claim 8, Richardson et al. discloses the essential elements of the claimed invention, but Richardson et al. is silent about resending at least a portion of the print job to the at least one print process module. However, Kim discloses resending at least a portion of the print job to the at least one print process module [370]. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teachings of Richardson et al. by including resending at least a portion of the print job to the at least one print process module, since Kim teaches that having resending at least a portion of the print job to the at least one print process module would be beneficial for the purpose of completing the printing processes [Kim: page 3, section [0041], lines 2-5].

7. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richardson et al. (US Patent 5,748,483) in view of Farrell et al. (US Patent 5,179,410).

Regarding claim 26, Richardson et al. discloses the essential elements of the claimed invention, but Richardson et al. is silent about printing device further includes a laser print mechanism. However, Farrell et al discloses printing device further includes a laser print

Art Unit: 2854

mechanism [column 4, lines 3-4]. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teachings of Richardson et al. by including printing device further includes a laser print mechanism, since having printing device further includes a laser print mechanism would be beneficial for the purpose of having a high quality printout.

*Allowable Subject Matter*

8. Claims 11 and 12 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Regarding claim 11, the prior art of record does not teach all the combined steps for a method of correcting an exception during a printing process at least partially controlled by a plurality of print process modules associated with a printing device keyboard arrangement including the step of wherein the predetermined rule is: if, for a predetermined period of time, a state of a current print job is processing, and a current state of the engine controller is ready, and a current state of the print controller is waiting for an associated print engine to be ready, then send a reset command to the print controller and send a reset command to the engine controller, to cause each of the print controller and the engine controller to return to a default state.

Regarding claim 12, , the prior art of record does not teach all the combined steps for a method of correcting an exception during a printing process at least partially controlled by a plurality of print process modules associated with a printing device keyboard arrangement

Art Unit: 2854

including the step of wherein the predetermined rule is: if, for a predetermined period of time, a current state of a current print job is pending cancellation, and a current state of the engine controller is received cancel request, and a current state of the print controller is waiting for cancel reply, then sending a reset command to the print controller and sending a reset command to the engine controller, to cause each of the print controller and the engine controller to return to a default state.

Regarding claims 11 and 12, the prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The prior art of record does not teach all the combined steps as discussed above in the "examiner's statement of reasons for allowance".

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wasseem H Hamdan whose telephone number is (571) 272-2166. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (first Friday off) 6:30 AM- 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew H Hirshfeld can be reached on (571) 272-2168. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

Art Unit: 2854

system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Wasseem H. Hamdan', with a stylized, flowing script.

Wasseem H. Hamdan

January 3, 2005